JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

Case 2:15-cv-06664-JD_Document 1 Filed 12/17/15 Page 1 of 13

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

| ourpose of initiating the civil do | cket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS | ON NEXT PAGE OF T | THIS FORM.) | , ., | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | DEFENDANTS IC SYSTEM, INC. | | |
| (EX (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A CRAIG THOR KIMM | f First Listed Plaintiff PHILAE CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) ddress, and Telephone Number) EL, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, 48, AMBLER, PA 19002 | | County of Residence o | f First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ON IN LAND CONDEMNATION CA THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLV | SES, USE THE LOCATION OF |
| 1110NL. (213) 340 00 | 00 D711. 110 | | | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISDI | CTION (Place an "X" in One B | ox Only) III. | CITIZENSHIP OF PRIN | NCIPAL PARTIES (Plac | re an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff |
| ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | □ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Par | ty) | (For Diversity Cases Only) PTI Citizen of This State □ | | and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF cipal Place |
| 2 U.S. Government | 4 Diversity | isa in Ham III) | Citizen of Another State | 2 | |
| Defendant | (Indicate Citizenship of Part | ies in Hem III) | Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | | ☐ 6 ☐ 6 |
| IV. NATURE OF SUIT | (Place an "X" in One Box Only) | | | | |
| CONTRACT | TORTS | | FORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES |
| □ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ∞ Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property | 310 Airplane | PERSONAL INJURY 165 Personal Injury - Product Liability 1667 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 1688 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 1688 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability 1689 Asbestos Personal Injury Product 1680 Asbestos Personal Injury Product 1680 Asbestos Personal Injury Product 1680 Asbestos Personal 1680 Other Fraud 1781 Truth in Lending 1782 Brook Personal 1783 Property Damage 1785 Property Damage 1785 Property Damage 1785 Property Damage 1786 Property Damage 1787 Property Damage 1788 Property | TABOR TY | 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 840 Trademark 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g)) 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | □ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes |
| V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" △ 1 Original | emoved from | e Court | Reopened Anot (special | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION | Cite the U.S. Civil Statute un 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. Brief description of cause: FAIR DEBT COLLECTION | <u></u> | iling (Do not cite jurisdictional statu | | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: | | CLASS ACTION | DEMAND S | CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND: | if demanded in complaint: ⊠ Yes □ No |
| VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY | (See instructions): | DGE | 1 | DOCKET NUMBER F | FORMTEXT |
| DATE 12/16/2015 | SIC | GNATURE OF ATTOR | RNEY OF RECORD | | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY | MOUNT | APPLYING IFP | JUDGE | MAG. JU | DGE |
| RECEIPT # A | MOUNT | APPLYING IFP | JUDGE | 1711 10. 30 | |

Case 2:15-cv-06664-JD Document 1 Filed 12/17/15 Page 2 of 13

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

| assignment to appropriate calendar. | |
|--|--|
| Address of Plaintiff: 1508 East Washington Lane, Phila | delphia, PA 19138 |
| Address of Defendant: 444 Highway 96 East, St. Paul, M | |
| Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:(Use Reverse Side For Ad | ditional Space) |
| | |
| Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) | Yes No |
| Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? | Yes□ No. |
| RELATED CASE, IF ANY: | D . T |
| Case Number: Judge | Date Terminated: |
| Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: | |
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year | ar previously terminated action in this court? |
| | Yes No. |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su action in this court? | in pending of within one year proviously terminated |
| | Yes□ Not |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier many earlie | imbered case pending or within one year previously $Yes \square \qquad No \overset{\bullet}{\boxtimes}$ |
| terminated action in this court? | J. G.S. INO. INO. INO. INO. INO. INO. INO. INO |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights | case filed by the same individual? |
| 4. Is this case a second of successive indoes corpus, seems even of approximately appr | Yes□ No. Yes□ No. |
| | |
| CIVIL: (Place / in one category only) | |
| A. Federal Question Cases: | B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: |
| 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts | 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts |
| 2. □ FELA | 2. □ Airplane Personal Injury |
| 3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury | 3. □ Assault, Defamation |
| 4. □ Antitrust | 4. □ Marine Personal Injury |
| 5. □ Patent | 5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury |
| 6. Labor-Management Relations | 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) |
| 7. □ Civil Rights | 7. Products Liability |
| 8. □ Habeas Corpus | 8. Products Liability — Asbestos |
| 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases | 9. □ All other Diversity Cases |
| 10. □ Social Security Review Cases | (Please specify) |
| 11. All other Federal Question Cases | |
| (Please specify) 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. | |
| ARBITRATION CERT | |
| (Check Appropriate Co. | |
| □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and | belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of |
| \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; | |
| □ Relief other than monetary damages is sought. | |
| DATE: 10, 16, 15 | 57100 |
| DATE: 12-16-15 Attorney-at-Law | Attorney I.D.# |
| NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the | ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. |
| I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or | within one year previously terminated action in this court |
| except as noted above. | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| /// | |
| DATE: 12-16-15 | 57100 Attorney I.D.# |
| Attorney-at-Law | . Indiana de la companya de la compa |

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

| | : | CIVIL ACTION |
|-----------------|---|--------------|
| NICOLE DEZOICE | : | |
| IC SYSTEM, INC. | i | NO. |

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

| Telephone | FAX Number | E-Mail Address | | |
|--|---|-----------------------------|-----|-----------|
| 215-540-8888 x 116 | 877-788-2864 | kimmel@creditlaw.co | om | |
| Date | Attorney-at-law | Attorney for | | |
| 12-16-15 | | Plaintiff, Nicole De | zoi | <u>ce</u> |
| (f) Standard Management – | Cases that do not fall into an | y one of the other tracks. | (|) |
| (e) Special Management – C commonly referred to as the court. (See reverse simanagement cases.) | cases that do not fall into trace complex and that need specified of this form for a detailed | al or intense management by | (|) |
| d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. | | |) | |
|) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (| | | (X | (1 |
| (b) Social Security – Cases r and Human Services den | Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. | | |) |
| (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b | Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. | | |) |

(Civ. 660) 10/02

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

| NICOLE DEZOICE, |)) |
|-----------------------|---|
| Plaintiff, |))) Case No.: |
| v IC SYSTEM, INC., |)) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR) JURY TRIAL |
| Defendant. |) (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) |

COMPLAINT

NICOLE DEZOICE ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against IC SYSTEM, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an action for damages brought by an individual consumer for Defendant's violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA") and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq. ("TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United

States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331, which grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

- 3. Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
 - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19138.
 - 6. Plaintiff is a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a debt collection company with its headquarters located at: 444 Highway 96 East, PO Box 64378, St. Paul, Minnesota 55164.
- 9. Defendant is a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).
- 10. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(6), who repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a "debt" as defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692(a)(5).

11. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 12. Defendant collects, and attempts to collect, debts incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, for personal, family, or household purposes on behalf of creditors using the U.S. Mail, telephone and/or internet.
- 13. Upon information and belief, the alleged debt arose out of transactions for personal, family and/or household purposes.
- 14. Beginning in or around February 2015, Defendant placed repeated harassing telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone in its attempts to collect an alleged debt owed by another person identified as "Anne Knight."
- 14. Upon the parties' initial communication, Plaintiff informed Defendant that it was calling the wrong person, that "Anne Knight" was her daughter, that she had her own cellular telephone number and that "Anne Knight" could not be reached at Plaintiff's cellular telephone number.
- 15. Further, Plaintiff instructed Defendant to stop calling her on her cellular telephone.
- 16. Defendant acknowledged this information and said "Ok, we're sorry."

- 17. Plaintiff took further efforts to have her cellular telephone number removed from Defendant's system by following the telephone prompts to select the option provided.
- 18. However, Defendant failed to update its records to restrict calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 19. Rather, Defendant continued to call Plaintiff knowing that it was not the person that owed the alleged debt.
- 20. Defendant called Plaintiff, on average, once a day on her cellular telephone.
- 21. Defendant's calls originated from the number including, but not limited to: (307) 316-7474. The undersigned has confirmed that this number belongs to Defendant.
- 22. Plaintiff has had this cellular telephone number for more than one year.
 - 23. Plaintiff has only used this number as a cellular telephone number.
- 24. The phone number has been assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls.
- 25. Defendant never had consent from Plaintiff to call Plaintiff's cellular telephone number as Defendant was calling the wrong person.
 - 26. Furthermore, upon information and belief, Defendant used an

automatic telephone dialing system, automated message and/or prerecorded voice when contacting Plaintiff.

- 27. Plaintiff knew that she was receiving automated calls and messages, as Defendant left voicemail messages on her cellular telephone and the message sounded like an automated recording as it was a computerized voice, not the voice of a real person.
- 28. Defendant's telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were not made for "emergency purposes."
- 29. Defendant, despite the above, failed to acknowledge its mistake or notify Plaintiff that its collection activities would cease.
- 30. Upon information and belief, Defendant conducts business in a manner which violates both the FDCPA and TCPA.

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

COUNT I

- 31. Defendant's conduct violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692b(3).
 - a. A debt collector violates 1692b(3) of the FDCPA by communicating with any person other than a consumer more than once unless requested to do so by such person or unless the debt collector reasonably believes that the earlier response

of such person is erroneous or incomplete and that such person now has correct or complete location information.

b. Here, Defendant violated § 1692b(3) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff more than once about a debt belonging to a third party, despite having been notified that it was calling the wrong person.

COUNT II

- 32. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraph, violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692c(a)(1).
 - a. A debt collector violates § 1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by communicating with the consumer at any unusual time or place or a time or place known or which should be known to be inconvenient to the consumer, including communication between a debt collector and consumer prior to 8:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m.
 - b. Here, Defendant violated § 1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by placing numerous collection calls to Plaintiff to her cellular telephone about another individual's debt, which was an inconvenient time or place for Plaintiff to receive collection calls.

COUNT III

- 33. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692d and 1692d(5).
 - a. A debt collector violates § 1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct of the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.
 - b. A debt collector violates § 1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring or engaging any person in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called number.
 - c. Here, Defendant violated §§ 1692d and 1692d(5) of the FDCPA by repeatedly contacting Plaintiff on her cellular telephone and continuing to call Plaintiff about a debt of another person after being told to stop calling.

COUNT IV

- 34. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraph, violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692f of the FDCPA.
 - a. A debt collector violates § 1692f of the FDCPA by using

unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.

b. Here, Defendant violated § 1692f of the FDCPA engaging in other unfair and unconscionable debt collection practices, including failing to update its records to cease collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

COUNT V

- 35. Defendant's conduct, as detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.
- 36. Under § 227(b)(3)(A) of the TCPA, a person or entity may bring a private cause of action in an appropriate court based on a violation of the TCPA or the regulations prescribed under the TCPA to enjoin such violation
- 37. Under § 227(b)(3)(B) of the TCPA, a person or entity may bring a private cause of action in an appropriate court "to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation whichever is greater."

- 38. Despite the fact that Plaintiff never consented to Defendant placing calls to her, as it was calling the wrong person, Defendant repeatedly placed non-emergency calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 39. Based upon the conduct of Defendant, Plaintiff avers that the enhancement of damages provided for by the TCPA allowing for Plaintiff to recover up to \$1,500 per call/violation be applied to calls placed.
- 40. Defendant's conduct violated § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by placing repeated calls using an automatic telephone dialing system to Plaintiff's cellular telephone without prior express consent.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, NICOLE DEZOICE, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1693k(a)(3);

- Statutory damages of \$500.00 per telephone call in violation of d. the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
- Statutory damages of up to \$1,500 for each call in violation of e. the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(c)(5)(B) and 227(c)(5)(C), which permits the Court in its discretion to award such damages if it finds that Defendant willfully or knowingly violated the TCPA; and
- Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court. f.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, NICOLE DEZOICE, demands a jury trial in this case.

Date: 12-16-15

25

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:

CRAIG THOR KIMMEL Attorney ID No. 57100 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com